



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,295	06/26/2003	Geoffrey Howard Harris	MS1-1478US	7876
22801	7590	12/07/2007		
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER NGUYEN, LE V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/07/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/609,295	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HARRIS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> LE NGUYEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-97 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-97 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 1/30/04.
2. Claims 1-97 are pending in this application; and, claims 16-97 are drawn to the non-elected claims and are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 9 and 11 have been cancelled; and, claim 1 has been amended. This action is made Final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robbin et al. (US 2003/0167318 A1, "Robbin") in view of Broadus, and further in view of Hitson et al. ("Hitson").

As per claim 1, although Robbin teaches a computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the following when executed by a computer: receiving a request to perform a media operation with respect to a media file (paragraphs [0029], [0033]-[0034] and [0049]); determining a media provider to which the media file is attributable; assessing if the media provider allows the media operation to be performed with respect to the media file (paragraphs [0029], [0033]-[0034] and [0049]; host computer provides media); and performing the requested media operation if allowed by the media provider (paragraphs [0033]-[0034] and [0049]; given are examples of operations allowed by provider and performed by provider), Robbin

does not explicitly disclose the media provider is among a plurality of media providers. Broadus teaches receiving and playing media files from a plurality of media providers (col. 5, line 62 through col. 6, line 11). It would have been obvious to include the method of Broadus with the method of Robbin in order to provide users a plurality of media programs from different media providers.

Robbin and Broadus still do not explicitly disclose denying the requested media operation if not allowed by the media provider. Hitson teaches denying the requested media operation if not allowed by the media provider (Abstract; paragraph [0153]) It would have been obvious to include the method of Hitson with the method of Robbin and Broadus in order to provide a layer of security.

As per claim 2, the modified Robbin teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the determining is performed with the aid of a unique identifier for the media provider that is within the media file (Robbin: [0036]).

As per claim 4, the modified Robbin teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the determining is performed without communication across a communications network (Robbin: fig. 2; wherein a cable has been selectively established between media player 202 and PC/host computer 204 prior to communication).

As per claims 5-8, the modified Robbin teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the assessing is performed by executing computer code/code module associated with the requested media operation received from the media provider (Robbin: [0036]; wherein an API is required for invoking code modules). The modified

Robbin further teaches assessing code and/or information from a remote source as is well known in the art (Broadus: col. 6, lines 9-16).

As per claim 10, the modified Robbin teaches a computer-readable medium comprising communication with the media provider (Robbin: fig. 2). The modified Robbin further teaches communicating with the media provider if the media operation is not allowed by the media provider and presenting options to a user through the user interface for gaining allowance from the media provider (Hitson: Abstract).

As per claim 12, the modified Robbin teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the media operation includes downloading the media file to a portable media playing device (Robbin: paragraph [0026]).

As per claim 13, the modified Robbin teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the media operation includes recording the media file onto a permanent medium (Robbin: paragraph [0026]).

As per claim 14, the modified Robbin teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the media operation includes recording the media file onto a compact disk (Robbin: paragraph [0026]).

As per claim 15, the modified Robbin teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the media operation includes recording the media file onto a digital video disk (Robbin: paragraphs [0026] and [0053]; the passages describes recording media items on disks wherein media items include videos).

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robbin et al. (US 2003/0167318 A1, "Robbin") in view of Broadus, in view of Hitson et al. ("Hitson") and further in view of Nykanen et al. ("Nykanen").

As per claim 3, although Robbin teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the determining is performed with the aid of a unique identifier for the media provider that is within the media file ([0036]), Robbin does not explicitly disclose the unique identifier being a header. The use of headers as unique identifiers are well known in the art as taught by Nykanen et al. (paragraph [0041]). It would have been obvious to include the method of Nykanen with the method of Robbin in order to keep metadata and content data separate and preserve the integrity of the content.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3 and 5-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ramaley et al. (US 2002/0138619 A1) teach a method and system for managing and distributing digital media.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP §

706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

### ***Inquires***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley, can be reached at (571) 272-3923.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lvn  
Patent Examiner  
December 5, 2007

/David A Wiley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174